A CONFUTATION of the DUTCH-ARMINIAN TENENT, of *Universal Redemption*.

With Relation in special, unto certain Sectaries, in ENGLAND.

By name, the *Moriants*, or *Revelaters*, with others tracing them; who hold, *That Christ died for all men, good and bad.*

By THEOPH. BRABOURN.

Matth. 7. 6.

Give ye not that which is holy, to dogs; neither cast ye your pearls, before swine.

LONDON,
Printed by WILL. BENTLEY,
Anno Domini 1691.

8: J. 557 Th.

To the READER.

THis ensuing Discource (Christian Reader) lying by me, and fitted for the Press; but with thoughts, never to have it Printed so long as I live: my mind is now altered, very lately, upon this occation: Finding by sad experience, that this Dutch-ARMINIAN Tenent, of Universal Redemption, hath of

late invaded our English *Nation, and infected the minds, and perverted the judgement of many, who pretend highest for God and godliness; I could not but alter my thoughts, and resolve to publish this Discourse, if it may be, to prevent the further growth and spreading of it. There is a Sect of* Revelators, *or* Manifestators, *called* Morians; *of one* More *dwelling near* Wisbech, *who with his Disciples, about eight or nine years since, were orthodox in this point with us; but since, finding this* new light, *of* Universal Redemption, *to be a notable*

table means to further another and more ancient new light, *which formerly he had received and taught; namely, his doctrine of* Free-grace, *as he calls it, presently he set abroach this* Universal Redemption *among his Disciples: of and from whom (as I suppose) our* Independents *of later time, have borrowed this light: for of late, some of them are not ashamed to teach and preach it publickly, offering Christ and the benefits of his death, to* dogs *and* swine, *to the worst of men, saying, Come* Whoremaster, *come* Drunkard, *the work is wrought for you, believe it,* &c. *and they*

may as well say, Come Rascal, *come* Rogue, *come Tag and Rag, believe it, Christ died for you all. Thus they fear not, to give* Christ *that* Pearl *and* Holy thing, *unto dogs and swine. Their new* Arminian *light hath taught them, to give the* Childrens bread *to dogs. Not long since, some of the* Bishops *were tainted with this Error, and how odious were they for it in the eyes of these very men? but now themselves are infected with the same Error, and it is become a lovely Truth: and what have these men to say for this Error more than the* Bishops *had? surely, if so much, yet no-*

thing

thing more, unleſs it be this, that it is a bright beam of new light *ariſen to them of late; and notably tending to* their *new doctrine of* Free grace, *as they call it; and that the* ſpirit *hath taught it them: but remember, that there is a* Spirit of Truth, *and a* ſpirit of Error, 1. *John* 4. 6. *and ſo I end.*

THEO. BRABOURN.

A CONFUTATION of the ARMINIAN Tenent, of *Universal Redemption.*

IN handling this Controversie, I shall first propound sundrie Arguments against it. Secondly, I shall make answer unto the Texts alleadged by Arminians, for proof of their Tenent. Thirdly, I shall confute a common Answer of theirs, given to a notable Objection of ours. And Fourthly, I shall confute their distinction of Impetration and Application. I begin with the first of these: and these are my Arguments against it.

ARGUM. I.

If Christ forbade his ministers, to give, or deliver his Word and Sacrament concerning his death, unto all men, as unto unbelieving, impenitent, scandalous, and wicked men; Then Christ did not give or deliver himself to death for all men: or, then Christ died not for all men. The reason hereof is this; If Christ had given himself to death for all men, good and bad, then would he have his ministers to do so too, in delivering the Word and Sacrament; and it is against reason to think, that Christ should give himself for all men, and forbid his ministers to give him to all men, or to some men: so there is the same reason of both: Now if he forbade his ministers, to deliver his Word and Sacrament unto all men, unto wicked and impenitent men, then surely, he did not deliver himself to death for all men.

For 1. It is absurd to think, that a ministers *Commission*, in delivering the Word and Sacrament, concerning Christs death, should be of less extent than Christ his death is of; as, that his Cõmission should extend but to some men onely, when Christ his death extends

tends to all men: wherefore if his Commission be but unto some men onely, then Christ his death is not to, or for all men, but to and for some men onely. 2. The Word and Sacrament concerning Christ his death, are *signs* representing Christs death unto us; now the sign and the thing signified by it, must be of equal extent; as, if the sign belong but unto some men onely, then Christ his death, the thing signified by it, belongs not unto all men, but unto some men onely. 3. If Christ would not permit his ministers, to give the *bread* and *wine* in the Sacrament (which is the lesser) unto all men, then much less would he give himself which is the greater) unto all men: If he forbade his ministers, to give his bread and wine unto all men, much-less would he give his life, his own bodie and bloud for all men: if he denied the *Sign* unto wicked and impenitent persons, then much more would he denie there the thing signified, which is, his pretious bodie and bloud: so much for my proposition.

But Christ forbade his ministers, to

give, or deliver his Word and Sacrament concerning his death unto all men, as unto unbelieving, impenitent, ſcandalous and wicked men. This my aſſumption I thus prove, firſt concerning the *Sacrament.*

1. It is the doctrine, both of our own and other reformed Churches, that Chriſt would not have the Sacrament of the *Lords ſupper*, given by the miniſter unto unbelievers, impenitent, ſcandalous, and wicked men. 2. *Philip* would not give the Sacrament of Baptiſm unto the Eunuch, but upon the condition of his faith firſt, *Acts* 8. 37. S. *Paul* would not have the Lords ſupper given unto the inceſtuous perſon, 1. *Corinth.* 5. 1, 5, 13. nor unto impenitent wicked men, as not unto fornicatours, idolaters, drunkards, railers, nor extortioners, 1. *Cor.* 5. 11. and ſee *Matth.* 18. 17. So much for the Sacrament, next for the *Word.*

2. Concerning the *Word:* Chriſt would not have the word concerning his death, given or delivered by his miniſters unto unbelievers, impenitent, ſcandalous, and wicked men; which I thus prove:

In

In the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, the *Minister* delivers the bread, with these *words* of Christ, *This is my bodie, which is broken for thee:* the which words, are according to Christs institution, 1. *Cor.* 11. 24. *Luke* 22. 19. now forasmuch as Christ would not have impenitent wicked persons admitted to the Lords Supper, he would not have his ministers deliver unto them, this his *word* concerning his death, This is my bodie: which *is broken for thee:* so Christs minister may not say to a wicked man, Christ died for thee. Yet if Arminians doctrine be true, that Chtist died for all men, then a minister may say to the vilest impenitent person, were he a *Judas* or worse, Christ died for thee. And by the way, I wonder that *Independents* can hold forth Christ to all men in a Sermon, saying, Come whore-master, drunkard, *&c.* Christ died for thee; and yet refuse to give the Lords supper to scandalous persons, saying to them; Christ died for thee. 2. Our *Saviour* would not have *holy things given to dogs*, nor *pearls to swine*, Matth. 7. 6. now wicked and impenitent persons, appearing incor-

rigible, are dogs and ſwine; & Chriſt, whether given in the *word* or in the *ſacrament*, is an holy thing, and pearl: wherefore a miniſter may not give Chriſt to an incorrigible wicked man, ſaying, Chriſt died for thee. 3. S. *Paul* preached the *word* concerning Chriſts death at *Antioch*, Acts 13. 14, 16, 27, 38. where being a mixt multitude, of ſheep and goats, of wheat and tares, he directs his ſpeech unto the ſheep and wheat, not unto the goats and tares; for he ſpake as he ſaid, *To thoſe that fear God*, Act. 13. 16, 26. and ſo ſoon as ſome of his Auditours appeared to be goats and tares, and ſuch as feared not God, he turned away from them, and carried away the Goſpel unto the Gentiles, refuſing to preach the word of Chriſt unto them, *Acts* 13. 45, 46. and ſee *Acts* 19. 9. whereby you ſee, S. *Paul* a miniſter of Chriſt, would not deliver the *word* concerning Chriſts death, unto wicked men, and ſuch as feared not God.

It may be objected, that S. *Paul* ſaith, *It was neceſſarie*, that this *word ſhould firſt be preached unto them*, that is, unto thoſe goats and tares, the obſtinate

ſtinate Jews *Acts* 13. 46. and ſo *Paul* preached of Chriſts death, as well to wicked men as to the godly. Hereunto I anſwer, 1. As the Husbandman beſtoweth the ſame pains, upon the tares as upon the wheat, before the tares appear to him to be tares; ſo the Apoſtle might preach Chriſt to the wicked, as well as to the godly, they being together in a mixt aſſembly, before the wicked appeared to him to be wicked: but yet as the husband-man takes pains for the wheats ſake, and not for the tares ſake; ſo *Paul* might preach Chriſt, for the godly's ſake, and not for the wicked's ſake: and it is evident in the Text to be ſo: for *Paul* directs his ſpeech unto the godly in the Aſſembly, to thoſe that *feared God*, *Acts* 13. 16. 26. excluding the wicked: for when in an Aſſembly, there are both godly and wicked, if the miniſter directs his ſpeech to the godly, he excludes the wicked; or if he directs an uſe to the wicked, he excludes the godly. 2. So ſoon as theſe tares, the obſtinate Jews, appeared to *Paul* to be tares, as you ſee, he refuſed to preach Chriſt unto them, *Acts* 13. 45,

46. and for the ſame cauſe, had he known them at the firſt to be tares, and if he could have ſeparated them from the aſſembly of the godly, he would not have preached Chriſt unto them at the firſt. True it is, *Paul* ſaith, It was *neceſſarie* that the Word ſhould be preached vnto them: for it could not be avoided, being they were mixed with the godly, and did not at firſt appear to be tares: it was therefore neceſſarie for *Paul* to preach unto them, with the godly at the firſt, though he intended not his doctrine to be for them. Thus I have proved my Aſſumption: and ſo the concluſion follows thus,

Therefore Chriſt did not give or deliver himſelf to death for all men: or, Chriſt died not for all men. So much for my firſt Argument.

ARGUM. II.

If Chriſt would not pray for all men, then Chriſt would not die for all men. The reaſon thereof is this; If Chriſt would not do the leſſer for all men, then he would not do the greater for all men: If Chriſt would not offer to God, the *calves* of his lips for all men, then

then he would not offer to God the *sacrifice* of his pretious bodie and bloud for all men: If Christ would not bestow so much *love* upon all men as to pray for them, then would he not bestow so much love upon all men as to die, and to shed his heart bloud for them: In a word, If Christ would exclude some men from his prayers, surely he meant to exclude them from his bitter death and passion. So much for my proposition.

But Christ would not pray for all men. For proof hereof see *John* 17. 8, 9. where believers are distinguished from the world, that is, from the world of unbelievers; and for these men who then did believe, Christ prayed, saying, *I pray for them*, vers. 9. and Christ prayed also for those men, who should afterwards to the worlds end believe in him *vers.* 20. but for the world, that is, for the world of unbelievers, Christ would not vouchsafe so much as to pray to God for them, saying, *I pray not for the world*, vers. 9. So much for proof of my Assumption, and so my Conclusion follows.

Therefore Christ would not die for all

men. And by consequence, *Christ did not die for all men:* for look what Christ would not do, that he did not do: unless we should imagine, that Christ his will, and his actions, were contrary one to the other: or, that he did do that, which he did not first will to do.

Arminians in their *Acta Synodalia, de Morte Christi*, pag. 319. do answer to my Assumption, and to my Text brought to prove it, thus; Christ saith not, that he *would* nor pray for the world, that is, that he would never afterwards pray for them; but thus he saith, that he *doth* not pray for the world, that is, that he doth not for that present time pray for them; or that he doth not in this particular prayer, *John* 17. 9. pray for them. Hereunto I thus reply.

1. Though I shall prove by and by, that there is more in Christs words, than Arminians do grant, yet this which they do grant, is sufficient to make good my argument: for this is in the Text, and they grant it, that Christ said, He *did* not pray for the world, that is, at that time and in that particular prayer, he did not pray for

for them: from which it doth undeniably follow, that as he *did* not then pray for them, so he *would* not *then* pray for them; or it was his will, at that time and in that prayer, not to pray for them, but to exclude them from his prayer, and from the benefit thereof. This I thus make good.

A wise mans actions and words, do flow from his understanding and his will; and his words and deeds, are regulated and governed by his will; so as what he doth or speaketh, the same he first willed; and what he refuseth to do or to speak, the same he willeth, or willeth not to do or speak, I say, being a mans actions and words are regulated by his will, both in his speech, and in his silence refusing to speak, whensoever, he is so silent, as that he refuseth to speak, it is manifest that it is his *will* to be silent, and to refuse to speak: wherefore when Christ said, I pray not, or I do not now in this prayer pray for the world; hereby it is evident, that at that time his will, was not to pray for them; but that his will was against it, or his will was against praying for them at that time:

time: because he willed silence at this time, and refused to pray for them in this prayer.

When a father having ten sons, saith, I give unto my nine elder sons, an hundred pounds apeece, but is silent saying nothing of his tenth or youngest son; suppose it will not hence follow, that the fathers mind and will was to denie him, and to refuse to give him an hundred pounds; yet it is otherwise in this case: for when the father saith, I give an hundred pounds apeece to my nine elder sons, but as for my tenth and youngest son, who is a wicked man, a riotous and prodigal son, I give him nothing; here it is manifest, that the fathers *will* was, to exclude the youngest son, and to be unwilling at that time that he should have an huudred pounds: so our Saviour, having many good and godly followers of him, who were believers, saith, I pray for them *John* 17. 9. and for all them, *John* 17. 20. but as for the world, that is, for impenitent and unbelieving men, I pray not for them, *John* 17. 9. here it is clear, that as he did not then pray for them, so he would not

at

at that time pray for them: for he voluntarily excluded them from his prayer, when he prayed for others.

Such negative speeches as this in *John* 17. 9. are voluntary denials, refusals, or exclusions; not onely signifying a thing not done, but also a will not to do it, as you may see *John* 8. 11, 50. and 13. 18. *Gal.* 2. 2.

Thus it is proved, that as Christ did not in that prayer pray for the world, so it was not his will but against his will, then to pray for them: now hence it followeth, That if at any time Christ did voluntarily refuse to pray for any men, then he would not die for them, or then he would refuse to die for them: and so you see, that from what Arminians do grant, my argument is made good: but I shall further prove, more to be in Christs words, than what they grant, and thus I prove it.

2. As Christ did not pray for the world, and also as is proved, Christ would not at that time and in that prayer pray for them; so it is gatherable from the Text and context, that Christ would never afterwards pray for them; the which Arminians deny, and

and this I here prove: Christ his prayer, though uttered and made then, yet the virtue and extent of it lasted after, or unto the death of that present world of impenitent wicked men: for as Christs prayer, once made for the godly, extends it self for their good, unto their death, *John* 17. 9, 11, 15, 21, 24. so Christs exclusion of that wicked world, from the benefit of his prayer once, must be an exclusion of them for ever after: unless it could be shown, that after Christs prayer, that wicked world converted and believed, which cannot be shown. Now if this wicked world were ever after the same, why should Christ alter his mind towards them? why should he pray for them afterwards, more than he did before? and I can but marvel, that Arminians should grant, that once Christ *did* not pray for that world, and yet suppose that afterwards he did pray for them; and yet have no ground for this supposed thing.

2 The ground and reason of Christ his prayer, will clear it up, that as he did not for the present pray for the world, so he *would* not for the future pray

pray for them; or so he would never after pray for them. The reason why Christ prayed for believers, was because they *believed in him*, John 17. 8,9,20. and because they were Gods people, *for they are thine*, John 17. 9. and because God the Father had *given them to Christ*, John 17. 9. On the contrary, the reason why Christ prayed not for the world, must needs be, because they were worldlings, wicked and impenitent persons, unbelievers, and were none of Gods people, nor given to Christ: now this being the *cause*, why Christ refused to pray for them at that present time, *John* 17. 9. for the *same cause*, Christ could never pray for them afterwards: for many of that wicked world, lived and died impenitently, and in unbelief, *Luke* 7.30. *John* 3.19. *Acts* 13. 45, 46, 50. *Luke* 19. 41, 42. *Rom.* 9. 27, 31, 32. 2. *Cor.* 3. 14, 15. *Mark* 4. 11, 12. If their unbelief hindered Christs prayer at that time, *John* 17. 9. it must for ever after hinder his prayer: because many of them were ever after unbelievers, and the very same men as before, when Christ refused to pray for them.

So

So much for my ſecond Argument.

ARGUM. III.

If Chriſt ſo loved all men, as to give himſelf and die for all men; then would he have cauſed the Goſpel to be preached to all men; by means whereof, they ſhould have knowledge of his death, and might believe in him, ſo as to be the better for his death. This I thus prove.

1 He that willeth the End, he willeth the means tending unto it, and whereby it muſt be obtained: the end and the proper or neceſſary means cannot be ſeparated: Chriſts death for men, is the End, the preaching of Chriſts death in the Goſpel, is the means for men to know it, and to believe in him, ſo as to be the better for it: wherefore, if Chriſt ſo loved all men, as to die and give himſelf for them, he could not but out of the ſame his love, have given them knowledge of it by preaching, which is the means of faith, that ſo they might partake of the benefit of his death.

2 If Chriſt out of his love *John* 3. 16. and 15. 13. died for all men, then if he would not give all men knowledge

ledge of it, whereby they might apply it to themselves, or believe in him, that so they might be the better for his death; then he is like a Physician, pretending the greatest love possible to cure his friend, by preparing and making a most soveraign potion for him; but sets it behind or under the bed, or in some secret corner of the chamber, where it is impossible for the sick man to find it: all this is but a pretence of love: for if it were true love, he would have set it where the sick man should have had knowledge of it, or he would have given him knowledge of it, that so he might make use of it for his health: so if Christ had died for all men, all men should have known it, and must have had it preached unto them, that so they might make use of it for salvation.

3 They may as well say, God intendeth by ordinary means, to save a mans natural life, and yet denie him food, as to say, Christ intended to die for the salvation of all men, and yet denie them the knowledge of it by the Gospel preached. So much for my Major.

But

But Christ neither would nor hath caused the Gospel to be preached to all men; whereby they should be brought to faith, and be the better for his death. This I thus prove, 1. The Gospel is not in these days preached to many *Indians*, and barbarous nations. 2. In old time before us, the Gospel, or any thing of Christ, was not preached to millions of Gentiles, *Psal.* 147. 19,20. *Acts* 10.12,28. and 16. 6, 7. *Ephes* 2. 11, 12, 13, 14. 3. Christ preached to some men in parables, and darkly, to this end, that they should not obtain remission of sins, and be the better for his death, *Mark* 4. 11, 12. So much for my Minor; and the conclusion follows.

Therefore Christ did not so love all men, as to give himself, and to die for all men.

Before I have done with this Argument, I must answer an Objection, which my Reader may make; and confute an Answer, which the *Arminians* do make: the Objection is this, you said in your first Argument, that Christ would not have the word concerning his death (which is Gospel) to be preached to wicked, impenitent, and

and unbelieving men: and here in this third Argument, you say, that the Gospel ought to be preached to all men; and among all men, are many wicked men, *&c.* Hereunto I answer, that this is no contradiction: for in my first Argument, I spake absolutely and as the truth is; but here in my third Argument, I speak not absolutely, but conditionally, with an *if*: as, If Christ died for all men, then the Gospel must be preached to all men, be they godly or wicked: so this I speak but upon a supposition of the truth of the Arminian tenent, which if it be true, then this follows, that Gospel must be preached to all men, good and bad. So much of this Objection: and now I come to the answer of Arminians, which is this.

The Arminians in their *Acta Synodalia, de Morte Christi*, pag. 327, 328. do answer this my third Argument thus: that a limitation is to be added to my Major, and then my Minor will be false: thus therefore they frame it a new, and limit it: *If Christ so loved all men, as to die for all men; then would he have caused the Gospel to be actually preached to all men; or else be*

be prepared and in a readineſſe to have it preached, ſo ſoon as men be fitted to receive it.

The better to colour this limitation, they make a twofold calling, a common or general calling, and a ſpecial calling: by the general calling, they underſtand the law and light of nature, as the natural knowledge that there is a God, and of the law of God, to which men ow obedience: now to him that uſeth this aright, God is prepared to communicate unto him his ſpecial calling, which is, the preaching of the Goſpel: ſo the well uſing of that, is a fitting and preparing of men for this: and the reaſon why many men are denied the Goſpel, is their own fault, becauſe they do abuſe the light of nature, or the general calling: ſo then Gods will is, to have the Goſpel preached actually to all men that are fitted for it; and is *prepared* to have it preached to others, ſo ſoon as they be fitted for it, and ſo be they do not put a *bar* in the way to hinder God, by their evil deſerts, and unfitedneſs.

Hereunto I thus reply, I will not contend about this order and method of

of God, that first he willeth all men, to make good use of the law and light of nature; and then and not before to vouchsafe the Gospel to them; be this true or false, I will not question it, but rather grant it for argument sake: but yet this I denie, (though it be never so true in it self) that this limitation shall be added to my Major, *That God is prepared to have the Gospel preached to men, so soon as men be fitted for it and not before*; for this is an absurd limitation: and it is to maintain one Errour by another, the which I make thus appear,

1 They say, as it is, implied in the antecedent part of my Major, That Christ died for all men: and then they would add to it this, That some of those men are not fit to know it, or not fitted to hear of it and receive it (for this is implied in their limitation:) now is not this an absurd thing to be added? as first to hold, that Christ died for all men, and then to add to this, that some of those men are not fit to hear of it, or to know it? This were detestable, if it were held, that though men be unfit to know it at some one time of their lives, yet

yet they ſhould be fit at ſome other time before death; but foraſmuch as men abuſe the light of nature all their lives long, and ſo die impenitently, therefore they muſt hold, that many men are never fit, to hear of or know, what Chriſt hath done for them: and is it not abſurd to ſay, Chriſt died for many men, who nor are, nor ever ſhall be fit to know it? or Chriſt died for many, who ſhall never be fit to know what he hath done for them? are they fitted for Chriſt to die for them, and not fitted to know he died for them?

This conceit is like unto this; A man pays a ranſom, to redeem one from captivitie or priſon, but the priſoner or captive is not fit to hear or know of it, ſo long as he liveth: or like unto this, A Phyſitian, makes an excellent and healthfull potion or cordial for his ſick patient, but adds this, ſaying, He ſhall know of it ſo ſoon as he is fit to know of it and to receive it, when as he knows the patient ſhall never be fit ſo long as he lives; is not this abſurd? Therefore, if they will hold, that Chriſt died for all men, they muſt hold alſo, that they

are

are fit to know and hear of it: which being so, this is a frivolous and absurd limitation, to add saying, or else God and Christ be *prepared*, to cause the Gospel to be preached to men, so soon as they be *fitted* for it, or be fit to receive it.

2 Christ foresaw, that many men in the world, would never make a good use of the law and light of nature, whereby to be fitted to know of his death. If therefore this was no hinderance for Christ to die for them, then this is no hindgrance for the Gospel to be preached to them: for there is as good reason for the one as the other: yea the reason is stronger, to think mens unfitness should rather hinder Christ to die for them, than to hinder a sermon of Christs death to be preached to them: for Christ his bloud is of more value, than a ministers words and breath: wherefore, if Christ died for all men, then are all men fit to hear of it: and so this limitation of *fitness* is frivolous.

Furthermore, those whom Christ died for, those he loved infinitely, and unspeakably, *John* 3. 16. and 15. 13. now if it be true, as Arminians say,

ſay, that Chriſt died for all men, the
he infinitely and unſpeakably love
all men, even thoſe who abuſed th
general call, *the light of nature*, albe
he foreſaw they would live and die i
in the abuſe of it: and was his lov
ſo hot and ſtrong to thoſe men, as t
paſs by this abuſe, when he ſhed hi
hearts bloud for them; and was it be
come ſo cold and weak to them afte
ward, as to ſtick at it and not paſs i
by, when he thought of cauſing a ſe
mon of his death to be preached t
them, whereby they might be th
better for his death? was Chriſt
love ſo hot, as to require no fitne
in them, when he died for them, an
was it become ſo cold afterward, a
to ſtick at theſe mens unfitneſs t
hear a ſermon of his death? ſurely
if nothing in theſe men, could hinde
Chriſt to die for them; then nothin
in them, can hinder a ſermon of Chri
to be preached to them: if there
needed no qualification in them, t
render them fit for Chriſt to die fo
them; then there needs no qualifica
tion in them, to fit them to hear
ſermon of Chriſt: unleſs you ſuppo
more virtue or dignitie to be in
ſerm

sermon of Christ, than is in the bloud of Christ: so you see, this limitation of fitness is vain.

3 To say, Christ died for all men; and then to add this unto it, That they shall not have the Gospel (which is a necessary means of obtaining the end of Christs death) preached unto them, unless they be fit for it, or untill they be fitted to receive it, is a very absurd addition and limitation as you have seen: so it is also as absurd, to say, God or Christ is *prepared* and in a *readiness*, to have the Gospel preached so soon as men be fitted for it: for there be thousands of *Indians* and others, who live and die in the abuse of the law and light of nature, and so are never fit for the Gospel, and who never heard the Gospel: now can it be truly said, that God or Christ hath *prepared* himself, to use and apply means unto such, as never will be capable of the means? and unto such, as he well knows and foresees will never be capable of it? did ever any wise man *prepare himself*, to do any thing, the which he fore-sees shall never be done? and yet such a preparation Arminians do ascribe un-

to the wise God. Will a Physitian *prepare* himself, to give phisick to a dead man, or to one whom he knows will never be fit to take it?

Moreover, If this fitness be prerequired, then thus I reason: God not onely fore-sees that many will never be fit for the Gospel, but also is resolved in himself, that the Gospel shall never be preached to them; because he fore-sees, they shall and will live and die unfitted; now can it be said, that God is *prepared* to do that thing, which he is *resolved* in himself shall never be done? you may as well say, God is *prepared* to save the reprobate angels and *devils*. Thus you see, there is cause enough for me to reject this limitation and addition to my Major: wherefore my Argument must stand as I framed it; without this their addition: and then it is strong and good to prove, that Christ died not for all men: and it is unanswerable, their answer being confuted. So far of my third Argument.

ARGUM. IV.

If God the Son, died for the sins

all men; then God the Father, will justifie the persons, and pardon the sins of all men.

But God the Father, will not justifie the persons, and pardon the sins of all men: for if he should, then all men should be saved, *Mark* 16.16. *Luke* 13. 3. *Revel.* 21. 8.

Therefore God the Son, did not die for the sins of all men.

As for my Major, thus I prove it. 1 Arminians say, that by the word *world*, John 3. 16. we are to understand, all men in the world: now if God the Father so exceedingly loved all men, as to give his onely begotten Son to die for them, *John* 3. 16. then he can do no less than justifie the persons, and pardon the sins of all men: because, 1. He loved all men: and he gave his Son for none other end, but for all men to obtain justification, and pardon of sin: now surely, God will not loose his *love*, nor fail of his *end*, nor waste and spill in vain, the *bloud* of his onely Son: all which he should do, if he should not justifie all men, after he had given his Son for them, and to justifie them. If it be in his power, will any wise

man looſe his love, be fruſtrated of his end, and ſpend all his labour and coſt in vain?

2 Chriſt is the *Lamb* of God, that *taketh away* the ſins of the *world*, *John* 1. 29. now if Chriſt hath taken away by his death, the ſins of the *world*, that is, (as Arminians ſay) of all men; then God the Father, cannot *retain* their ſins: thoſe mens ſins, which are removed or *taken away*, cannot be unpardoned or *remain* upon them: wherefore if Chriſt died for all men, and hath *taken away* the ſins of all men, then ſurely God the Father, hath or will juſtifie and pardon the ſins of all men, or elſe, Chriſt that Lamb hath not taken away their ſins.

3 If God the Father, *gave* Chriſt his Son, to die and pacifie his wrath for the ſins of all men, *John* 3. 16. then God the Father, cannot but *accept* of his ſons death; it being according to his own will, and being his own *gift*: and if he accepts of it, then his wrath muſt needs be pacified for the ſins of all men, and ſo he cannot denie to juſtifie all men, and pardon their ſins.

4 God

4 God the Father, in giving his Son; and God the Son, in giving himself, both aimed at one and the same end, namely justification and pardon of sin; and both aimed at the same persons for obtaining this end: or else, God the Father, and God the Son, were not both of one mind, but of diverse or contrary minds: wherefore, if God the Son died to obtain pardon of sins for all men, then God the Father, will vouchsafe pardon of sins to all men.

5 If God should not justifie all those men, for whom Christ died, he should be unjust: for Christ gave himself to death, as λύτρον a *ransom* for all men, as Arminians say, 1. *Tim.* 2. 6. a ransom, is the full price for the redemption of a prisoner or captive: now when a king takes a ransom for a thousand captives, if he deliver not them all and every one, he is unjust: so God the Father, having taken and received at the hands of Christ, a full price and ransom, for the sins of all men, as Arminians say, he should be unjust, if he should not set free from sin, all and every man in the world. Furthermore, if God shall not justifie

and set free all men, there will be fraud and folly imputed to God and Christ: for where there is fair and honest dealing, the buyer and the seller are agreed upon the same terms, as if the buyer intendeth to have so many in number, be it ten, twentie, an huudred, or a thousand, the seller intendeth the same number also, and the same persons: or else there is fraud in the one, and folly in the other: now Christ is the *purchaser*, and if he intended by his death to ransom all men, then God the Father, must intend the same, and must justifie and deliver from wrath even all men: He must in justice deliver as many as Christ bought, and the same persons, that is, all men in the world: or else, you impute fraud and folly to God and to Christ.

I shall inlarge my self upon this last Argument, by descending to some particulars, as thus; If God shall not justifie and save eternally *Judas*, *Pharaoh*, *Cain*, *Corah* and his wicked company, for whom Christ died, as say Arminians; then he shall be very unjust: this I thus prove: If Christ died for *Judas*, *Pharaoh*, and other abomin-

bominable wicked men; then have they suffered in this life, the full wrath of God for all their sins, and have made a sufficient and perfect satisfaction to Gods justice already here: for though they suffered not in this life in their own persons; yet if it be true, that Christ died for them, then they suffered in the person of Christ, when in this life he died on the Cross for them, which is to be reckoned as their own death and suffering. This I thus prove; Look what a mans surety performs for him, that is reckoned as done by himself: as, in case my surety payeth my debt, it is reckoned as my payment: for thereby I am discharged. So if Christ paid the debt of *Judas*, *Pharaoh* and the rest, it is as if they had paid it in their own persons: and so they must be discharged. Hence it follows,

That since *Judas* and others, have suffered in the person of Christ, which is to be reckoned as their own suffering, 1. That *Judas* and *Pharaoh*, have made a full and perfect satisfaction to Gods justice for all their sins, having suffered in this life the second death, and hell with the pains thereof, or

what is equivalent thereunto. 2. That God must in justice, justifie and save this wicked crue eternally: or else he will be an unjust Judge: for he shall punish one sin twice, once in Christ the suretie, and once again in *Judas* the principal. So much for proof of my Major: as for my Minor, it needs no proof, it being so clear.

Answer.

Arminians do answer thus to my Major: That it followeth not, that if Christ died for all men, then God must justifie and save all men: for God may interpose the condition of *faith*, to go between Christs death for *Judas* and others, and the act of Gods justification: and so as though Christ died for all men, yet God will not justifie any of them, unless they first believe.

Reply.

1 It is absurd to suppose, that God would put in a *condition*, after he hath taken a *ransom* and payment of a full price. Conditions are always made before the price is payd; but never after the price is paid and received: what man that selleth house

or

or land doth put in a condition, after he hath received his money? Wherefore, since Arminians will not have the condition of Faith, to go before Christs death, it is too late to put in this condition after Christs death: for by his death, the ransom and price is fully paid and received; paid by Christ, and received by God the Father.

2 If Christ died for *Judas* and all men, considered absolutely as sinners and without faith, as Arminians hold; then God the Father, must justifie *Judas* and all men, considered absolutely as sinners and without Faith, and so the condition of Faith cannot be interposed: for the Buyer and Seller (if there be fair dealings between them, so as one doth not over-reach the other,) are both agreed upon the same terms; so as if the Buyer purchaseth and payeth the price without any condition, then the Seller that takes the price, must give up the thing bought and paid for, without any condition: and so God cannot be said, to put in the condition of Faith, between Christs death and the act of justification.

3 Since Arminians hold, that Chriſt died for all men as ſinners, and without the condition of Faith; God cannot in juſtice require the condition of Faith, before he will juſtifie them: for if he ſhall require it, then many thouſands for whom Chriſt died, dying without Faith, muſt be damned, and ſuffer for their ſins eternally in the next life: now if Chriſt died for them in this life, and ſuffered for them, and in their room, ſtead and place, then God ſhall be unjuſt to puniſh theſe men for their ſins in the next life, though they die without faith: for ſo he ſhall puniſh one ſin twice, once in Chriſt their ſuretie, and once in themſelves the principal. Since *Judas* hath ſuffered for his ſins, in the perſon of Chriſt in this life, God ſhall be an unjuſt Judge, to puniſh *Judas* for his ſins in the next life, though he hath no faith: for God hath (as they ſay) puniſhed *Judas* his ſins in the perſon of Chriſt, and therefore he ſhall be unjuſt to puniſh him alſo in his own perſon. It is extream injuſtice, to require a debt both of the ſuretie, and alſo of the principal: wherefore *Judas* his debt, being paid

to

to God by Christ, God cannot in justice require the *condition* of *Faith* of him, so as for want of it to damn him, and to cause him to suffer for his sins in the next life, and so to pay his own debt in his own person: for so God should require one debt to be twice paid: and so you see, that the condition of *faith*, cannot be interposed betwixt Christs death, and justification; being that God in justice must justifie and set free from the debt of punishment, all those men whose debt Christ hath paid, whether they believe or not believe: when God looks upon *Judas*, as having suffered in the person of Christ, he cannot but see his justice fully satisfied, and therefore cannot but justifie and free him, believing or not believing: wherefore, to interpose the condition of Faith, is to make God an unjust Judge.

4 I shall here add one thing, which will both strengthen my Major, and also confute their answer. They say, Christ died for all men; and therefore they must so generally understand the Text, 2. *Cor.* 5. 15. which saith, *He died for all*, &c. now all those who Christ died

died for, those he *reconciled* to God his father. *He is the reconciliation not for our sins onely, but also for the sins if the whole world.* 1. John. 2.2. And all those who Christ died for, 2.*Cor.*5.15. God the Father *reconciled* unto himself. 2.*Cor.*5.19. *God was in Christ, and reconciled the world to himself*; that is, God was in Christ, when he died on the Cross for the sins of all men, and reconciled them unto himself: now as God reconciled all men or the world, so he justified them all: for the Text saith, *He did not impute their sins unto them*; 2.Cor. 5.19. Furthermore, *reconciliation*, doth presuppose justification to go before: for the partie offended, is not said to be reconciled, untill he hath first forgiven the offence and the offender. So then the *world* which Christ died for, the same *world* God justified: thus you see my Major confirmed.

Next to confute their answer: Faith cannot be interposed betwixt Christs death, and Gods justification, so as to hinder any man for whom Christ died from justification: because *those* whom Christ died for, 1. *John* 2.2. 2.*Cor.*5.15. *those* God justified, *not imputing their*

their sins unto them, 2. Cor. 5. 19. and those *God reconciled unto himself*, 2. Cor. 5. 19. so Faith cannot be any condition, so as to hinder any man by want of it, for whom Christ died, from justification: because all those Christ died for, all those God reconciled and justified: if Christ died for *Judas*, then God justified *Judas*; yet *Judas* had no faith interposed betwixt Impetration and Application, for he was no believer. If *Arminians* say, Christ died for all men; then *Paul* saith, God justified all men; and I may say, God justifieth them whether they believe or not believe: for faith cannot be interposed. So much for my fourth Argument.

ARGUM. V.

If Christ died for all men, then God the Father loved all men, and that with a special and incomparable love. My reason here is; Because God the Father *gave* his Son, yea his onely Son to death for them: now for a Father to deliver up to death his Son, yea his onely Son, for a man; this bewrays love to that man, yea matches love. See a text for it, *John* 3. 16. *God so loved the world, that he gave his onely begotten*

begotten Son, &c. What greater love than this did ever God ſhew to the world, than when he *gave* his onely begotten *Son* to die for them?

But God the Father did not love all men, with a ſpecial and incomparable love. This I thus prove: Becauſe there are, and ever were many unbelieving wicked and impenitent men in the world, who lived and died in Gods hatred: *I have loved* Jacob, *and have hated* Eſau, *Rom.* 9. 13. and ſee *Rom.* 9. 22. *The wicked, and him that loveth iniquitie, doth his ſoul hate*, Pſal. 11. 5. *Thou hateſt them that work iniquitie*, Pſal. 5. 5, 6.

Therefore Chriſt did not die for all men.

To avoid the ſtrength of this Argument, Arminians, perhaps, will anſwer thus, That God loved all men as ſinners, but hateth them as impenitent ſinners, *&c.* Hereunto I reply, That this is a diſtinction unheard of, and no where grounded in the Scriptures that I know of, and therefore it is to be rejected. That God loveth all men, as his creatures, may paſs as a ſound poſition; but that God loveth all men, as ſinners, and that with an incom-

incomparable and matchles love, is to me most unsound: for a thing considered as evil, is no object of love, but of hatred: and so much for my fifth Argument.

Thus I have by five Arguments proved, That Christ died not for all men: and so I have finished the first thing propounded at the beginning: and now I come to the second, which is to make answer unto the Texts of Scripture, brought by Arminians to prove, That Christ died for all men.

An Answer *unto the Texts alleadged by* Arminians, *to prove an* Universal Redemption.

JOHN 3. 16.

God so loved the world, that he gaue his onely begotten Son, &c.

BY this Text Arminians would prove, that Christ died for all men: and for this end, they urge the word *world* in the Text; which they will needs have generally and universally taken, so as to signifie all men in the world, whether good or bad, believers

lievers or unbelievers: and so as Christ should die for all men in the largest sense. *Answer.*

1 I take it for a great weakness in Arminians, to build so confidently upon the word *world*, urging, that it must be generally taken here, for all men in the world: who knoweth not, that knows any thing in Scripture, that general words are very often used by holy pen-men particularly? The general word *all*, is often used particularly for *some*, or for *many*, as in *Matth.* 3. 5. 1. *Cor.* 1. 5. and 13. 2, 7. and 9. 25. and 6. 12. and 10. 23, 33. many examples may be given for other words also, but passing by them, I shall instance in the word in question.

The word *world*, is sometime taken for all men in the world, as in *Rom.* 5. 12. and sometime it is taken for all men in the world, excepting eight persons, as in 2. *Pet.* 3. 6. 1. *Pet.* 3. 20. *The world that then was perished, over-flowed with water:* and sometime it is taken for the most men in the world, as in 2. *Cor.* 4. 4. *John* 15. 18, 19. and 17. 9. *The God of this world hath blinded the minds*, &c. and sometime it is taken for the lesser number of

of men in the world, as in *Acts* 17. 6. *John* 12. 19. *These are they which have subverted the state of the world.* And, *Behold the world goeth after him.* Now since this word is so variously used, how can they be so confident as to averr, that it must be taken in the largest sense?

My answer therefore is, that as the word *world*, is sometime taken for the lesser number of men in the world, which are *Disciples* and followers of Christ, as in *John* 12. 19. so it may be taken also in their Text alleadged, *John* 3. 16. for *believers*, who are the lesser number of this world: and this is my first Answer.

2 I shall prove, that the word *world*, is used for believers onely: and then it will follow, that as there is a world of the wicked, so there is a world of believers also: for this end,

See *John* 1. 29. *Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.* Though Arminians say, that Christ, this Lamb of God, died for the sins of the world, and for all men, by way of *Impetration*; yet they hold, that Christ hath not justified, or procured justification for all men in the world,

world, by way of *Application*; nor for any men but for believers onely: now this Text ſpeaks of *Taking away the ſins of the world*, which is no leſs, than to procure Juſtification, and to make Application of Chriſts death, by freeing men from their ſins: and therefore this text is not to be underſtood, of the world of all men, but of believers onely, and of the world of believers: for no mens ſins are *Taken away*, but believers onely, ſee 2. *Cor.* 5. 19. *God was in Chriſt, and reconciled the world unto himſelf, not imputing their ſins unto them.* Here the *world* that were reconciled, & juſtified, their ſins being not imputed, was not the world of all men, but of believers onely; it was the world of believers only, unles you will ſay, all men in the world are juſtified.

See *Rom.* 11. 12, 15. *If the fall of them, be the riches of the world*, &c. Again, *If the caſting away of them, be the reconciling of the world*, &c. Here by the *world*, is not meant all men in the world, but the Gentiles onely: for the Jews are not compriſed in the word: nor are all the Gentiles compriſed therein, but onely the believing Gentiles: for the fall of the Jews;

Jews, was no *riches* to unbelieving Gentiles; nor was the casting away of the Jews, the *reconciling* of unbelieving Gentiles: and that it is spoken of believing Gentiles, may further appear by these words in the Chapter *Rom.* 11. 11. Through their fall, *salvation* unto the Gentiles, *Rom.* 11, 17. Some of the *branches* be broken off, and thou a *wild olive tree*, was grafted in, and partaker of the *root and fatness of the olive tree*, *Rom.* 11. 20. Through *unbelief* they are broken off, and *thou* standest by *faith*.

See *John* 6. 33. *The bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world.* Here by the word *world*, we must understand, believers, and the world of believers: for Christ *giveth* not *life* to unbelievers.

Thus by four Texts I have proved, that the word *world*, is often used for believers, and for the world of believers: now from hence my answer is this, that since the word *world* is often used for believers, & for the world of believers; therefore this their alleadged text *Jo.* 3. 16. may be understood of believers onely, and of the world of believers: and this is my 2d Answer.

3 I ſhall here prove, not onely (as before) that by the word *world*, believers, and the believing world may be meant; but that they are and muſt of neceſſitie be meant, and this is evident by the Text and context.

For this is a *Rule*, that general words are to be reſtrained according to the matter in hand: now the matter in hand, or the perſons handled and ſpoken of, are believers; this you may ſee clearly expreſſed, in *John* 3. 15, 16. That whoſoever *believeth* in him, *&c.* verſ. 15. God ſo loved the world, *&c.* that whoſoever *believeth* in him, *&c.* verſ. 16. wherefore believers, being the perſons ſpoken of, the general word *world*, is to be reſtrained to believers.

The queſtion or main thing laboured to be proved and cleared, is, That *believers* ſhall not *periſh*, but have *life eternal*, as you may ſee *John* 3. 15. to prove and amplifie this, S. *John* brings a reaſon in the next verſe, *John* 3. 16. as you may ſee by the particle (for, or becauſe.) *For*, God ſo loved the world, that he hath given his onely Son, that whoſoever believeth in him, ſhould not periſh, but have life eternal;

nal; which is as if he had said, Believers shall not perish, as the question is in *verse* 15. *For*, God so loved believers, or the world of believers, as to give his onely son for them, that whosoever doth, will, or shall hereafter believe in him, shall not perish, as it is in the reason alleadged in *verse* 16. I confess, the word *believeth*, or according to the Original *believing*, is in the present tense or time, but it must be understood of all tenses and times, past, present, and to come: so as Gods love in Christ, was to them that did believe before Christs time, to them that do believe in Christs time, and to them that shall or will believe after Christs time: this is added, to prevent an Arminian objection, saying, if by *world*, believers be meant, then the word *whosoever*, implies a distinction, as if there were two sorts of believers, one believing, the other not believing at one and the same time: but the word *whosoever*, may be understood distributively or distinctively, of believers before Christs time, of believers in Christs time, and of believers after Christs time, to the worlds end. But so return,

turn, for as much as the *queſtion* and thing to be amplified, was the ſalvation of believers *verſe* 15. it is not reaſonable, to underſtand the *reaſon* and amplification brought to confirm it in *verſe* 16. of any other perſons than believers. It were impertinent to argue thus, Believers ſhall not periſh; *for*, or becauſe God loved the world of all men, and gave Chriſt his Son for all men: this is to prove a ſpecial and peculiar mercy belonging unto ſome men onely, by an argument which is general, and belongs to all men. Now by the ſame Argument, it may as ſoundly be proved, that not onely Believers ſhall not periſh, but alſo that no man in the world ſhall periſh; *for*, or becauſe God loved the world of all men, and gave Chriſt his Son for all men: and ſo you ſee, that by the word *world*, believers and the world of believers onely, muſt of neceſſitie be meant.

The Text ſaith, *God ſo loved the world:* now it is clear, that God doth not love all men in the world, with ſuch a peculiar, matchleſs, & *incomparable* kind of love, as the Text ſpeaketh of: for there are many thouſands of

of men in the world, which God is so far off from loving, as that the Scripture saith expressly, God hateth them: *Esau have I hated* Rom. 9. 13, 22. *Prov.* 16.5. and 6. 16, 17, 18, 19. *Psal.* 5.5,6. and 11.5. wherefore, since God loveth not all men in the world with an incomparable love, therefore by the word *world* in *John* 3. 16. cannot be meant, all men in the world: nor any besides believers: for God so loved them onely.

4 Arminians may as well say and hold, that all men in the world shall be *justified* and *saved* eternally; as to say and hold, that Christ died for all men in the world: for it is said, 2. *Cor.* 5. 19. God was in Christ, and *reconciled* the *world* to himself, *not imputing their sins*. If here the word *world* be largely taken, after the fashion of Arminians, then all the men in the world, are *reconciled* to God, and their sins *forgiven*, or not imputed unto them; and then they must be eternally saved. And see *Rom.* 11. 15. The casting away of the Jews, was the *reconciling* of the *world*. And see 1. *John* 2. 2. He is the *reconciliation* for our sins; and not for ours onely, but also

also for the sins of the *whole world*. And see *John* 1.29. Behold the Lamb of God, which *taketh away* the sins of the *world*: so if by the word *world*, they will understand all men, then they must hold also, that all men in the world are reconciled to God, justified, and their sins taken away: and this is my last Answer to their Text *John* 3. 16. and so I come to answer another of their Texts.

1. *John* 2. 2.

And he is the reconciliation for our sins: and not for ours onely, but also for the sins of the whole world. Here again they urge the word *world*: and say it must be taken in the largest sense, for all men in the world: for the Text saith, not onely the world, as in *John* 3. 16. but the *whole world*, to note the universalitie.

2 The Text saith, *not for our sins onely*, that is, not for our sins onely who are believers; *but also for the sins of the whole world*, that is, for the sins of unbelievers as well as believers: and so all men in the world, both believers and unbelievers, even the whole world are here meant.

Answer,

Answer.

Enough hath been said in my former answer, touching the word *world*; shewing that it is often taken, not for all men, but for some, and for many men in the world, and for the world of believers; and so in this last sense it may be taken in this Text, 1. *John* 2.2.

But whereas they urge us in this Text, with the word *whole*, in that S. *Iohn* saith the *whole world*, this will nothing mend their cause: for as the word *world*, is often used for some, or for many men in the world, so are these words, the *whole World*: for this end note. 1. That other expressions, equivalent to this, and of as *large* extent as this, yet are not to be taken in the largest sense, but are used for many in the world, as in *Isa.* 23. 17. and 34. 1. *Lament.* 4. 12. *Col.* 1.6. *Mark.* 16.15. Secondly, these very words in question, namely the *whole world*, are used for many in the world: as in *Rom.* 1.8. your faith is published throughout the *whole World*: it is not credible, that every particular man and woman, in the *whole World*, had heard of the faith of these *Romans*.

And see 1. *Ioh.* 5. 19. we know that we are of God, and this *whole world* lieth in wickedneſſe. If the *whole world* here mentioned, ſo taken in the *Arminian* ſenſe, for all and every man in the world, how could S. *Iohn* exempt himſelf and other godly perſons living then with him, from lying in *wickedneſs?* ſo you ſee, that by theſe words the *whole world*, is not always meant, all and every particular man & woman in the world. *Arminians* may as well ſay, that S. *John* ſaith, *Ioh.* 5. 19. that all men then living were wicked men, & none godly; as to ſay, that the ſame Apoſtle in 1. *Ioh.* 2. 2. ſaith, that Chriſt died for all men in the *whole world*, none excepted: for S. *Iohn* mentions the *whole World*, in both Texts. So much for anſwer to their firſt inference from the Text.

As for their ſecond inference from this Text, it is built upon a needleſs and groundleſs expoſition of the Text: for thus they expound it. *He is the reconciliation for our ſins*; that is, for the ſins of us believers now living in the world: *and not for ours onely, but alſo for the ſins of the whole world*; that is, not for our ſins onely who are be-

lievers

lievers now living in the world, but also for the sins of unbelievers now living in the world: and so he is a reconciliation for the sins of the *whole world* now living, both believers and unbelievers. To this I thus answer.

1 For them to expound the Text, as belonging to wicked ungodly men and unbelievers, must needs be a false exposition: for it maketh God and Christ, to express their singular, matchless, and *incomparable love*, unto such men, as they foresaw would live and die in their wickedness, hatred of God, impenitency, and unbelief: now the Scriptures inform us, that God is so far off from loving such men, as that he *hateth and abhorreth them*, Psal. 5. [illegible], Psal. 11. 5. wherefore the Text must not be enlarged unto unbelievers.

2 The enlargement of Christs death and reconciliation, at the end of the verse, may very well and safely be understood of believers onely, after this manner: He is the reconciliation not onely for our sins, who are believing *Iews*; but also for the sins of the *whole world* of believers, both *Iews* and Gentiles: or thus, He is the

reconciliation not onely for our sins, who are believers now living; but also for the sins of the *whole World* of believers, living before our time, in our time, or that shall believe hereafter. The death and reconciliation of Christ, is to be extended unto all times, past, present, and to come: *Jesus Christ, is yesterday, and to day, and the same for ever*, Heb. 13. 8. Thus you see, how this Text may well be understood, not of all men, but of believers onely: and this sense suiteth well with the context, and matter in hand, or with the persons spoken of, who are *believers* onely, as you may see 1. *Ioh.* 2. 1, 3. So much for answer to their second Text, 1. *Ioh.* 2. 2. and so I come to their third Text,

1. TIM. 2. 6.

Who gave himself a ransom for all men, &c. Lo, here say they, it is clearly expressed, that Christ died, and gave himself to death, not for some men onely, but for *all men*: and it is evident also by the context, that this word *all*, must be universally taken and in the largest sense: for so it is taken *vers.* 1. I exhort that prayers be made for *all* men, *vers.* 2. and for *all* that

that are in authority, *vers.* 4. who will that *all* men shall be saved, and come unto the acknowledging of the truth.

Answer.

Here again, you see the weakness of *Arminians*, in that they build so confidently upon the word *all*; as if they had never read or heard, that this word *all* is very often used in Scripture particularly, for *some*, or for *many*: as in *Matt.* 3. 5. Then went out to him *Jerusalem*, and *all Judea*, and *all* the region about *Jordan*, and were baptized, *&c. Matt.* 4. 23. Jesus, *&c.* healed *all* or every sickness, *all* or every disease, *&c. Rom.* 15. 13. The God of hope fill you with *all* joy, *&c.* but carnal joy is not prayed for here, and see 1. *Cor.* 1. 5. and 13. 7. and 9. 25. and 10. 33, 23. and 6. 12. *Phil.* 2. 21. 3. *John* 12. Thus you see, how the word *all*, in 1. *Tim.* 2. 6. may be understood of *all* that are believers; who are not *all* men in the world, but some onely, or many.

Whereas they endeavour to prove by the context, that the word *all* must be taken in the largest sense; because it is so taken in the former verses: my

anſwer is, that the matter in the firſt ſix verſes is not one and the *ſame*, but diverſe. In *verſ.* 1,2. the matter is about good *government*, but in *verſ.* 4, 5,6. the matter is about mans *ſalvation*: now being the matter is diverſe, therefore the word *all* may be diverſly underſtood, as univerſally in *verſ.* 1,2. and particularly for *ſome*, in *verſ.* 4, 5, 6. and this is uſual in expounding of Scripture, to take the word *all* generally in ſome matter treated of, and particularly in ſome other matter treated of.

Whereas they urge the fourth *verſ.* who will that *all* men ſhall be ſaved; my anſwer is, that here the word *all* muſt not be taken in the largeſt ſenſe: for God will not have all and every man to be ſaved: for he willeth not the ſalvation of reprobates, impenitent, and unbelieving perſons, as you may ſee in *Rom.*9.11,13,18,21,22,27. *Rom.*11.8,9,10. 1.*Pet.*2.8. 2.*Theſ.*2. 10,11,12. *Ioh.*3.18. *Mark.*16.16. *Revel.*21.8. *Mark.*4.11,12.

To conclude, as the Text ſaith, He will that *all* men ſhall be ſaved: ſo it ſaith, that they ſhall *all* come to the knowledge of the truth, *verſ.* 4. now this

this cannot be understood of all men in the largest sense: for God doth not vouchsafe the Gospel and knowledge of the truth in our time unto many *Indians* and wild savages: and before our time, the Apostle *Paul* was forbidden of the holy Ghost, to preach the word in *Asia* and *Bythinia*, *Act.* 16. 6, 7. and further see these Texts *Mark* 4. 11, 12. *Mat.* 11. 25. *Ioh.* 12. 39, 40. *Psal.* 79. 6. so you see, the word *all* is not universally to be taken: and so much for answer to their third Text.

ROM. 14. 15. and 1. COR. 8. 11.

Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died. Rom. 14. 15. *Through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish, for whom Christ died.* 1. Cor. 8. 11. From both these Texts they gather, that Christ died for those that *perish*, as well as for those that perish not, but are saved: and if he died for those that perish, and for those that perish not; then he died for all men.

Answer.

1 That Christ died for those that perish not, but are saved: this they say, we grant: and that Christ died also for those that perish, and are not sa-

ved: this they prove by these two Texts, *Rom.*14.15. 1. *Cor.* 8. 11. To this their proof I thus answer, To *destroy* is one thing, and to occation or *hazard* destruction is another. To *perish* is one thing, and to occation or *hazard* perdition is another. Now these two Texts may be understood of the latter onely, namely of the occasion and hazard of perdition and destruction: for those strong Christians, did by their unseasonable use of meats offend the weak, and did thereby give them an occation of falling, of perdition and destruction: this sense the contexts give light unto, both in *Rom.*14.13. and in 1. *Cor.*8.9. and me think, Arminians cannot think, that the strong Christians, did by their unseasonable use of meats, *really* and *actually destroy* all those weak Christians, who saw them eat these meats, or who by their example, were emboldened to eat them: now if they did not perish and were indeed destroyed, how can Arminians say, Christ died for those that perish?

2 I answer, Whereas they undertake to prove, that some perished for whom Christ died: this is false, and cannot

cannot be proved by these two Texts: for admit, that by example of the strong, the weak Christians did eat meats against their conscience, and so sinned; yet it will not follow, that they were therefore destroyed, and *perished* eternally: unless Arminians will say, that by *repentance* of that sin, they could not be saved; or will be so uncharitable, as without a ground for it, to say, they lived and died in this sin without repentance. Sure I am, repentance is a salve for greater sins than this, *Acts* 11. 18. So it cannot be proved, that those weak Christians perished; and therefore it cannot be proved, that Christ died for those that perished. So much for answer to these two Texts, *Rom.* 14. 15. and 1. *Cor.* 8. 11.

HEBR. 10. 29.

" *Of how much sorer punishment suppose ye shall he be worthy, which treadeth under foot the Son of God, & counteth the bloud of the Testament as an unholy thing, wherewith he was sanctified.* Here say they, are some men for whom Christ died, being that they were sanctified by Christs bloud; and yet

became *apoſtates*, and ſhall be ſorely puniſhed: ſo then Chriſt died for thoſe that periſh, as well as for thoſe that periſh not: and if he died for both, then he died for all men.

Anſwer.

Whereas they collect from this Text, that ſome believers and ſanctified by the bloud of Chriſt, did indeed make apoſtaſie, and ſo as they periſhed; this collection is groundleſs: for the Text may be underſtood conditionally, or as a ſuppoſition; as if the Apoſtle had ſaid, *If* a believer, and one ſanctified by the bloud of Chriſt, ſhall make apoſtaſie and tread under foot the bloud of Chriſt, he ſhall periſh, or be ſurely puniſhed. Or thus, Of how much ſorer puniſhment ſhall a man be worthy, if he treads under foot the Son of God, *&c.* Now a conditional ſpeech, or a ſuppoſition, doth not affirm and aſſert the thing to be done indeed, but onely it ſuppoſeth a thing, or puts a caſe, as in *Hebr.* 10. 26, 38. ſo this Text doth not aſſert and affirm, that ſome believers either did or ſhould make apoſtaſie, and ſo periſh: that the Text may be underſtood

stood conditionally, as a supposition, and as a case put, I make it thus appear.

1 These are equivalent propositions; He that doth such a thing, and, If one doth such a thing: for example, He that sheds mans bloud, by man shall his bloud be shed, *Gen.* 9. 6. the which is equivalent to this, If one sheds mans bloud, by man shall his bloud be shed. So in like manner, He that apostatizeth and treads under foot the bloud of Christ, shall perish or be sorely punished, *Heb.* 10. 29. the which is equivalent to this, If one apostatizeth and treads under foot the bloud of Christ, he shall perish or be sorely punished, so it is indifferent to take either of the two expressions: and further note, that neither of the two do assert and affirm the thing to be indeed done; as it is not affirmed, that any have shed mans bloud, so it is not affirmed, that any believer hath apostatized, and troden under foot the bloud of Christ: it is onely said, He that doth it, *&c.* or, If one doth it, *&c.*

2 In *Heb.* 10. 26. our translators render it thus, *If we sin* willingly, *&c.* the

the which in the Original is in the participle thus, *we ſinning* willingly, *&c.* now ſince this latter, may be rendered conditionally, (ſo it muſt be rendered, unleſs we make believers guilty of wilfull ſinning,) why may it not be ſo too, three *verſes* after? for in *Heb.* 10. 29. in the Original it is in the participle thus, *Treading* under foot, *&c.* which may be rendered thus, If he tread under foot, *&c.* and ſo the Apoſtle doth not aſſert or affirm, that any man doth or hath indeed, troden under foot the bloud of Chriſt, or made *apoſtaſie*. Note further, that in *verſ.* 26. 27. you have the *queſtion*: in *verſ.* 28. you have the *argument*: and in *verſ.* 29. is the *application* of it to the *queſtion*. Now where the *queſtion* is conditional, the application muſt not be abſolute: and therefore the 29. *verſ.* muſt be conditionally underſtood.

3 The Apoſtle ſaith in the laſt *verſ.* ſave one, *Heb.* 10. 38. *If any withdraw* himſelf, *&c.* In which words, he ſpeaks of *apoſtaſie* and withdrawing conditionally: wherefore the *apoſtaſie* and treading under foot Chriſts bloud, mentioned before in *Heb.* 10. 29. ma-

be understood conditionally also: and so nothing is asserted as done.

4 In the last *vers. Heb.* 10.39. the Apostle speaking of believers, as he doth also in *Heb.*10. 26, 29. saith, *we are not they which withdraw ourselves.* Whereby he plainly signifieth, that the believers of whom he wrote in *Heb.* 10. 29. had not, or did not *withdraw* themselves, or make apostasie: wherefore the apostacy, in treading Christs bloud under foot, mentioned *Heb.* 10. 29. is not asserted or affirmed, as a thing indeed done by believers; but as a supposition, as if in case a believer should do such a thing, then he should perish or be sorely punished. So much for answer to this Text, *Heb.*10.29.

2. PET. 2.1.

There shall be false teachers among you, &c. *denying the Lord that bought them, and bring on themselves swift damnation.* Here say they, S. *Peter* affirms, that some men *bought* by the bloud of Christ, shall be false teachers, bring in damnable Heresies, deny the Lord Christ, and shall bring on themselves damnation: whence they argue as before, that Christ bought

bought or died for those that perish and *are damned*; and consequently for all men: for we say, Christ died for those that perish not, but are saved: and they prove by this Text, that Christ died for those that do perish, and are damned: so if Christ died for those that perish, and for those that perish not, then he died for all men: of this see their *Acta Synodalia de morte Christi*, pag. 346.

Answer.

1 It cannot be proved by this Text, that Christ bought those that *did* perish and *are* damned: for the Text doth not expressly say or intimate, that these false teachers, did ever after live and die in *impenitency*: for be it so, that they taught false Doctrine, brought in damnable Heresies, and denied the Lord Christ Jesus; yet they might repent of all these sins before they died, and so be eternally saved: *Paul* when he was a *Saul*, was a *blasphemer*, a *persecutor*, and an *oppressor*; and yet he was upon his repentance received to mercy, 1. *Tim.* 1. 13, 16. and he thought he was bound to do, *many contrary things against the name*

name of Jesus Christ, Act. 26. 9, 10, 11. whereby he denied the Lord that bought him, and yet he was not damned.

But perhaps they will urge the last words of the Text, that *they shall bring on themselves swift damnation.* To which I answer, that from these words it cannot be proved, that they *were* damned: for these words must be understood with an exception, unless they repent: as *Mat.* 3. 10. every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit, *is hewn down, and cast into the fire*, that is, unless they repent. *Revel.* 21. 8. But the fearfull, and the unbelieving, *&c. shall have their part in the lake, which burneth with fire and brimstone*, that is, if they repent not, but go on still in their sins till death: so, they shall bring on themselves swift damnation, unless they repent, and this is my first answer.

2 Whereas *Arminians* understand by the word [Lord] in the Text, the Lord Christ Jesus: and by the word [bought] in the Text, the redemption from sin and eternal wrath by the bloud of Christ: I deny both these senses of the words; and shall shew, that

that they may be well and ſafely taken in other ſenſes, which will nothing further their cauſe.

Firſt, for the word *Lord*: it may be underſtood of God the Father, or of God in general: for the clearing up of this, note, that in the new Teſtament, the word whereby Chriſt is noted uſually is Κύριον tranſlated Lord; but in this Text of *Peter*, we have an other word, which is Δεσπότην, and tranſlated Lord: and being an *other word*, and not uſual to note Chriſt, it is likely enough to be of an *other ſenſe*: we find this word Δεσπότης tranſlated Lord, and uſually applied to God the Father, or to God in general, or to earthly and fleſhly Lords and Maſters, not unto Chriſt as Mediator, as in theſe Texts, *Luke* 2. 29. *Act.* 4. 24. 2. *Tim.* 2. 21. *Jude* 4. 1. *Tim.* 6. 1, 2. *Tit.* 2. 9. 1. *Pet.* 2. 18. wherefore ſince this word is uſually, ſpeaking of God, underſtood of God the Father, why may it not be ſo underſtood alſo in this their Text, 2. *Pet.* 2. 1. and ſince it is ſeldom, or rather never underſtood of Chriſt as Redeemer, why ſhould it be ſo underſtood in this Text, 2. *Pet.* 2. 1.

Se-

Secondly, for the word *bought*: this may be understood of Gods buying and redeeming his people, from their bondage in Egypt, or from some other slavery, servitude, and bondage to their enemies; of which you may read in *Deut.* 9. 26. 2. *Sam.* 7. 23. *Psal.* 107. 2, 3. *Jer.* 15. 21. *Mich.* 4. 10. *Jer.* 31. 10, 11. And then the words of S. *Peter*, may be understood as an agravation of the sin of those false teachers, for that they should bring into the Church, such damnable Heresies, as whereby they should deny even the *Lord their God*, who bought and redeemed them from servitude and slavery, unto their oppressing enemies in the flesh. And the rather this sense may stand, because it so well suites with the other word δεσπότης *Lord*, the which is taken for God the Father, but seldom or rather never for Christ the Redeemer, and this is my second answer.

3 As touching the word ἀγοράσαντα, translated *bought* them: it may be rendered *taught* them: it may be translated *taught*: see *Crispine* and *Scapula*, who say, that the Noun ἀγορὰ, hath (besides an other signification)

cation) this for one, it signifieth an *oration* or *sermon:* & the Verbs ἀγορεύω, and ἀγορεύομαι, signifie to *preach* or *teach:* yea the word ἀγοράζω, signifies not onely to *buy*, but also to *consult*, and to *give counsel:* wherefore the Text may be thus translated: *Denying the Lord that taught them*, or *gave them counsel.* Now this makes nothing for proof that the Lord bought them, or redeemed them: and this is my third Answer.

4 If for all this, they will press the Text, and understand it of the Lord Christ, and that he hath bought and *redeemed* wicked persons and unbelievers, 2. *Pet.* 2.1. they may as well say also, that God *justified* the world of wicked men and unbelievers, 2. *Cor.* 5. 19. and that God *justifieth* the ungodly, as ungodly, *Rom.* 4.5. which is contrary to *Prov.* 17.15. and so much for answer to this their Text, 2. *Pet.* 2. 1.

ROM. 5. 6.

For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly. Lo here say they, is it not said expressly, that Christ died for the ungodly? If therefore Christ died as well

well for the ungodly, as for the godly, then Christ died for all men, for good and bad.

Answer.

There is another Text of like kind, 1. *Pet.* 3. 18. *Christ hath once suffered, the Just for the unjust*, &c. Wherefore one Answer shall serve to both.

True it is, that Christ died for the ungodly, and for the unjust: and had he not died for such, it had been wo to all godly persons: for as *Paul* saith of the godly and believing Corinthians, that there was a time, when they were ungodly and unjust, as *idolaters, adulterers, drunkards*, and *extortioners*, &c. 1. *Cor.* 6. 9, 10, 11. so may I say, there was a time before our conversion, when we were ungodly and unjust: if therefore Christ had not died for ungodly and unjust persons, no godly man now living could possibly be saved.

Wherefore we must distinguish of ungodly persons thus: There are some ungodly persons, who are become believing and penitent godly persons: and for these ungodly persons Christ died, as the Text saith:

and

and of such the Text speaketh, as is plain *Rom.*5.6,8,10. but there are other ungodly persons, who persist still even unto death in their ungodliness, refusing to repent and believe: now I denie that Christ died for these; or that the Text is to be understood of these. These are *dogs* and *swine*, wherefore *Christ* the *pearl* is not to be given to these, *Matth.*7.6. Christ would not vouchsafe to *pray* for these, *John* 17.9. and therefore he would not *die* for them: and this is my Answer to this Text.

Thus I have made answer, to all the Texts of Scripture, which seem to have any weight in them, for the Arminian cause: they have also some arguments, as two or three, but the one of them onely deserves an answer, so passing by the other, I shall here propound it, and make answer to it: you shall find it in their *Acta Synodalia* pag. 337. *de Morte Christi*

ARGUMENT.

Whosoever are bound to believe in Christ Jesus, for them Christ died.

But all men are bound to believe in Christ Jesus.

There-

Therefore for all men Christ died.

As for the Major they prove it by this reason: because if it be not true, some men, as those for whom Christ died not, are bound to believe a *lye* or a *falshood:* which is very absurd. The Minor they prove by this Text, *John* 3. 19, 36.

Answer.

I denie their Major: for it is not true, that Christ died for all those men who are bound to believe in him: that is, to believe in him, that he is the Son of God, and Saviour of the world, which is the right object of faith. And as for the reason, whereby they labour to prove their Major, it is unsound: for it leans upon an unsound (though common) description of justifying faith: for they describe it thus: *Faith in Christ, is a certain & full or plerophorie perswation of the mind, whereby we embrace Christ, with this confidence, that he died not onely for others, but also for us, or for me and my sins in particular.* This description however common, yet is it unsound: for it cannot be proved in Scripture: for I no where find in the Scripture, that

that the object of faith, is to believe that Christ died for *us*, or for *thee* and *me* in particular, as they suppose in their Argument: this I deny, and they must prove it if they can, and when they can. The object of justifying and saving faith is, to believe that *Christ is the Son of God*, the *Messias*, the *Saviour* of the world, and the like: and this is the current of the Scriptures every where: in particular see *John* 20. 31. *These things are written, that ye might believe, that Jesus is that Christ the Son of God: and that in or so believing, ye might have life*, &c. All men may be bound to believe this, and yet not bound to believe a *lye*: or those for whom Christ died not, may be bound to believe all this, and yet not be bound to believe a *lye* or a *falshood*.

Now that the Scriptures do every where make this the object of faith, that *Christ is the Son of God*, the *Messias*, the *Saviour* of the world, and the like; beside the Text alleadged *John* 20. 31. See also these Texts, *Matth.* 16. 16. the object of S. *Peters* faith, whereof he made confession unto, and before Christ, was this, *Thou art Christ, the*

the Son of the living God. Acts 8. 37. The object of the *Eunuch's* faith was the same, *I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.* Acts 9. 20. the sum of *Pauls* preaching, to beget saving faith in men, was this, That *Christ was that Son of God.* Acts 2. 36. the sum of *Peters* sermon, as touching Faith, whereby he converted three thousand souls unto the faith, was this, That he whom they had crucified, *God had made him both Lord and Christ.* 1. *John* 5. 5. who is he that overcometh the world, but he who believeth, that *Jesus is that Son of God?* So you see, the *victorious faith* is, to believe, that Christ is the Son of God. *Acts* 17. 3, 4. *Paul* preached, that Christ died and rose again; and that *this is Jesus Christ.* And by this sermon of Christ, he won many to the faith, as you may see in the fourth verse. *Acts* 18. 5. here you have another sermon of *Pauls*, that *Jesus was the Christ*; and this is the object of faith. *John* 1. 29, 34. S. *Johns* sermon was this, *Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sins of the world*, &c. and *This is that Son of God.* John 1. 49, 50. *Nathanaels* confession of faith, was this, *Thou art that Son of God*

God. John 4.7,25,29,39,42. The faith of the *woman* of *Samaria*, and of other the Samaritanes, was this, that *Jesus* was the *Messias*, and *the Christ*: and that *Jesus was that Christ, the Saviour of the world.* John 11. 27. the faith of *Martha* was, that *Christ was the Son of God.* Thus you see, that according to the current of the Scriptures, the object of faith is, To believe that Christ is the Son of God, the Saviour, with the like: now all men may be bound to believe these things of Christ, and yet not be bound to believe a *lye*, or those for whom Christ died not, may be bound to believe these things of Christ, and yet are not bound to believe a *falshood*: nor hence will it follow, that Christ died for them that are bound to believe this. But I no where read, that Christ required, or that the Apostles preached for such a particular applicatorie faith as this, That Christ is *mine*, or that Christ died for *our* sins, or that Christ died for *thee*, or for *me* in particular.

I confess I read of *Thomas* his faith, *Iohn* 20. 28. saying, *Thou art my Lord and my God.* And of *Pauls* faith, *Gal.* 2.20.

2.20. saying, *Who hath loved me, and given himself for me.* These indeed were acts of the two *Apostles* faith; but I no where read, that Christ required of *every man* this faith, as necessary to salvation; nor do I read, that the Apostles or any one of them, did *preach* this faith to the people, when in their sermons they preached to beget men unto the faith: wherefore I judge, 1. That this kind of faith is proper unto Apostles, and unto Christians of the highest form in the school of Christ; and not common to every weak Christian: for how then should they be saved? since many hundreds of *weak Christians*, neither can nor dare say, Christ is *mine:* or Christ died for *me* in particular. 2. I judge, that this act or kind of faith, is a consequent of justifying faith, and may safely and comfortably be concluded and collected, by strong Christians from it, thus; He that hath justifying faith, Christ is *his*, and Christ died for *him*. But I in particular have justifying faith: for I believe, that Christ is the Son of God, and the Saviour of the world; and my faith is accompanied with good works, as

Sanctification and Mortification, &c. Therefore Christ is *mine*, and Christ died for *me* in particular. So much for clearing of my Answer: and so much also for answer to their argument.

By this time we have finished these things propounded to be handled; First we have by sundrie Arguments proved, That Christ died not for all men. Secondly, we have answered all their Texts of Scripture, and their Argument, whereby they would prove the contrary. Now in the third place, we confute a common answer of Arminians, which they give to a notable objection of ours.

The Confutation of a common Answer of Arminians, *which they give to a notable Objection of ours.*

FIrst I shall propound *our* Objection. Secondly I shall give you the *Arminian* answer. And Thirdly I shall confute it in my Reply.

Objection.

If Christ died for *Judas*, and all other wicked and ungodly men, why are they not all *saved?* how can any be *damned*, for whom Christ died? for if Christ died for them, then have they suffered in this life in the person of Christ their suretie, the torments of the next life, which Christ upon the Cross bore for them, and in their room and place: now God having punished *Judas* and the rest, in the person of Christ on the Cross in this life, with the punishment due to the next life; he cannot punish them again in the next life, unless he be an unjust Judge, punishing the same men for the same sins twice: once in this life, and once more in the next life: and

therefore *Iudas* and all other men, must be saved, if Christ died for all men.

Answer.

Hereunto *Dutch* and *English* Arminians both, make this answer, *Iudas* and the rest will not *believe*: they refuse to believe in Christ, and so to apply him: and therefore God may justly damn them, *Joh.* 3. 18. *Mark.* 16. 16. see their *Acta Synodalia*, *de Morte Christi*, pag. 320. and this they endeavour to clear by some similitudes: If a *Physician* tenders a potion to a patient, he is not to be blamed, if the patient will not receive it and apply it; but the fault and blame is onely in the patient. So if God offers Christ, to *Iudas* and all other wicked men; but they will not believe in him and apply him, then the blame is theirs, and so God is free of injustice, though he damn them. An other simily is this; A *King* having many subjects in captivity under a foreign King, payes a full and sufficient ransom for every one of them; now many of those captives despise their liberty, and chuse to live in captivity and bondage; In this case there is

no

no blame in the King, but in the captives onely: So God and Christ have ransomed all men, but many men despise this ransom, by refusing to believe, and so choose to live in captivity and thraldom still; wherefore if God keep them under everlasting thraldom, he is not unjust or blameable, but these despisers onely are blameable.

Reply.

I shall first deal with their answer, and then with their similitudes: I begin with their answer.

1 Be it so, that *Judas* doth not and will not believe, but obstinately refuseth to believe; yet this freeth not God of injustice if he damn *Judas*; supposing that Christ died for *Judas*: for clearing of this, I ask *Arminians*, whether Christ died for men, considered as believers, or as sinners and unbelievers? Hereunto they will not say, as believers: for so they should justifie our Doctrine, which is, that Christ died for believers, and for them onely: wherefore they must answer, that Christ died for men considered as sinners and without belief; and so faith is no conditi-

on of *impetration*, or of Christs death and ransom paid for men: now if Christ impetrating, and paying a ransom for men, did it absolutely and without any condition or consideration of faith in them; then for *application*, God the Father cannot require *faith* in men before application, or before he will apply Christ his death unto them in justification: unless they will absurdly think, that Christ and God were not of one and the same mind, but were at *odds* and difference in the work of Redemption: as if Christ should buy and purchase us absolutely without a condition, but God should sell us upon a condition; so absurdly they should think, the *buyer* and *seller* should be at odds, and not agreed both upon the same terms: now since it must follow, that if Christ died for *Iudas* without respect to faith in him, then God cannot but justifie and save *Iudas* without regard to faith in him; then though *Judas* doth not believe, and wilfully refuseth to believe, yet God cannot in justice damn him for his not believing: because when Christ *bought Iudas* of God the Father,

ther, and God the Father *sold Iudas* to Christ, there was no condition of faith intended betwixt them: and therefore *Iudas* must be saved. If you say, that Christ died for *Iudas*, then God cannot require *faith* of him, so as he should for his infidelity, in justice damn & punish him in the next life; God cannot be so unjust, as to punish one man twice for his sins, as once in Christ his surety, and once again in himself the principal; one debt must not be twice payed: wherefore to alleadge a reason from *Iudas* his *unbelief*, why God may damn him in the next life, is to alleadge a reason, why God may deal unjustly in the next life.

Now what they should say to this I cannot devise, unless they will distinguish of *Iudas* his sins, and so make an hotchpotch of the work of *Redemption*, saying, that Christ died for some of *Iudas* his sins, but not for all, as not for his unbelief: and then it will follow, that Christ is made an *half* Saviour, or a partial Saviour: and Christ died for some of *Iudas* his sins, and *Iudas* dieth for other some of his sins: and, Christ died for all *Iudas* his

ſins ſave that one of unbelief, and *Iudas* is now in Hell for no ſins committed, but ſuffers onely for one ſin, namely his unbelief: theſe are abſurd and groundleſs fantaſies, never broched by any Chriſtian man, unleſs *Arminians* will be the firſt. 2. So ſaying, they contradict themſelves: for if Chriſt died not for unbelief, then he died not for all men: for many men are unbelievers, 2. *Theſ.* 3. 2. Chriſts death was for believers, or for unbelievers: we ſay, it was for believers, *ergo* they muſt hold, that it was for unbelievers. So much touching their anſwer; and now I come to their ſimilitudes, and firſt to that of a Phyſician.

1 This ſimily of a *Phyſician*, is altogether impertinent to their purpoſe; for by this ſimily it is cleared, that God in juſtice may damn *Judas* once, becauſe he refuſeth to believe; but it doth not clear that which is in queſtion, which is, that God in juſtice may damn *Judas twice* for his ſin of unbelief; that is, once in his ſurety Chriſt, and once more in his own perſon: this is high injuſtice: no ſimilitudes may or can make God to be unjuſt. If

If the patient refuseth to receive and apply the potion, he is to bear the blame; but it is not so in *Judas*, if he refuseth to believe and apply Christ: because if Christ died for *Judas* absolutely, and without respect to his belief or unbelief, as Arminians say, then he is not bound to believe in Christ, as a *means* to free him from damnation; for Christ hath already suffered his damnation for him, before God the Father required any faith in him, when he died for him, considered as a sinner or unbeliever: so *Judas* is not to be blamed for not believing; since Christ in dying for him and in his room, required or respected no faith in him; and it is too late for God the Father, to require the condition of faith in him, after he hath punished him and his sin in Christ.

Further, though in Physick, the patient is to apply the potion to avoid death, yet it is not so in the potion of Christs death, to free us from death: for here *man* is to do nothing, but to be *passive*, if Christ died for all unbelievers; but it is *God* who is to make application, & to apply Christs

death to men, whether they believe or believe not: becauſe he received and *accepted* Chriſts death for all men, believers or not believers: in what condition Chriſt *gave* himſelf for men, in ſuch condition God *received* Chriſt for men.

1 Though a Phyſician tenders a potion to his patient, ſo as he refuſeth to apply it he muſt die; yet it is not ſo to be applied, as if God tendered Chriſt upon the condition of faith, ſo as if they refuſe to believe they muſt be damned: for it is abſurd to think or ſay, that after God had received and *accepted* of Chriſt and his death for men, without any condition at all, be it faith or any other; he ſhould afterwards require a condition, or tender Chriſt upon a condition of faith. God having received Chriſts death for men without condition, he hath no tender to make unto men now, but to tender them juſtification, glorification, and freedom from condemnation; this or nothing is to be tendered: for after God hath puniſhed and damned a man in Chriſt, it is moſt abſurd to think, he ſhould then require of him, faith as a condi-

tion

tion and *means* to free him from damnation. Thus much for the simile of a *Physicia*.

2 As for the other simile of a *King* and the Captives, this is also impertinent: for 1. Be it so, that *Judas* and other captives do despise Christs ransom, and saith the means of it, yet this will not clear God of injustice, if he punish *Judas twice*; once in Christ his suretie, and once again in his own person: no simile can make God unjust, or to punish one man or one sin twice: God in justice may punish *Judas* his dispising once, as in Christ, or in *Judas*; but not twice, as in Christ and in *Judas* both. 2. This simile is unfit for the purpose, and therefore to be rejected: if it were fitted to our question, it should be thus framed: A *King* having many subjects in captivity to a forreign King, pays their ransom by his son, who is put into captivitie for them, and lies there in their room; but they despise their libertie, choose to live in captivitie still; wherefore the forreign King, may keep both the Kings *son*, and the *captives* also in prison and captivitie: can the forreign King do this injustice? So much for

for their second similitude.

I cannot imagine what Arminians should say to evade these things, unless they will coyn a new distinction, and strange to Christian ears, and so make a hotchpotch of the work of *Redemption*, saying, that Christ died for some of a mans sins, but not for all his sins, as not for his final unbelief, or *new infidelitie*, or infidelitie unrepented of, as they express it: and then they think to evade all by this answer, that God punished Christ for all *Judas* his sins, excepting his infidelitie, and punished *Judas* for his infidelitie; and so God punisheth no sin twice, nor is he unjust. But to this new distinction I thus reply.

1 It maketh Christ to be but a partial Saviour, or an *half* Saviour: for by this distinction they say, Christ died for some, or many of a mans sins, but not for all; for not for unbelief. 2. It maketh Christ to die for some of *Judas* his sins, and *Judas* himself to die for other some of his sins. 3. It maketh *Judas* and other wicked men and unbelievers, to suffer hell torments, for none of all their horrible and abominable sins committed in their

their life time; but onely for their final unbelief: for they say, Christ died and suffered for all their other sins. Now to say that wicked men do not suffer in hell, for their other horrible sins besides infidelitie, is not onely absurd, but manifestly false: as is to be seen *Matth.* 25. 41, 42, 43. *John* 5. 29. *Rom.* 2. 6, 8, 9. *Jude* 7. *Revel.* 21. 8. where we see, that wicked men suffer in hell, for their *unmercifulness, contention, unrighteousness, fornication, murther, sorcerie, idolatrie, and lyes:* so you see, they can make no evasion, but by coyning of a new distinction, which makes an hotchpotch of the work of Redemption, and is not onely absurd, but also manifestly false, as is proved. 2. If Christ died not for new infidelitie, then he died not for all men: for many believe not after invitation by the Gospel preached, which they call, new infidelitie, *John* 12. 37. So much for confutation of the Arminian answer, saying to us, that *therefore God may justly damn* Judas, *because he will not believe.* Now their *answer* being confuted, our *objection* remains good, namely, that if Christ died for all men, then it follows,

lows, that no man shall be damned, but that *Judas* and all men shall be saved. And so I come to the fourth and last thing propounded to be handled, which is, A Confutation of their distinction of *Impetration* and *Application*.

The distinction of Impetration *and* Application *confuted.*

FIrst we must know what Arminians understand by these terms. By *impetration*, they understand the death and passion of Christ, whereby he merited remission of sins and justification for all men. By *application*, they understand the fruit and benefit of Christs death and passion; which is (as I conceive it must be) the real and actual remission of sins and justification, applied unto the faithfull. The former, namely Impetration, is proper to God the Son: the latter, namely Application, is proper unto God the Father. Furthermore, they place Faith, between Impetration and Applicati-

plication; so as though Christ died and impetrated for all men, yet God justifies, and makes application of Christs death unto believers onely: now the better to help on the matter, they say, that these being acts of *grace* and *favour*, God may according to his infinite *wisdom*, order them according to his most free will: the which words, as I take it, are spoken in relation to Faith, that God may place it before or after impetration, as it pleaseth his wisdom. Having thus opened their meaning, I thus proceed.

As for this distinction of Impetration and Application, I acknowledge it: for as it is Christ that died or impetrated for us, so it is God that justifieth us, and makes application of Christs death unto us, *Rom.* 8. 33. And I am content, that they call what Christ did for us on the Cross, Impetration; and what God doth for us in relation to it, and by virtue of it, Application: but I mislike of their *division*, that they should divide the works of Christ and God; so as if Christ should impetrate and die for many men, to whom God makes no application of Christs death: for they say,

Christ

Christ impetrated for all men, believers and unbelievers, but God applies Christs death for justification to believers onely: now thus the Works of Christ and God, do not concurr in the same persons, but are divided: for God makes no application unto many men, for whom Christ made impetration. On the contrary we hold, that the works of God the Father, and God the Son, are undivided: distinguished they may be, but divided they may not be: they always concurr as touching the same persons; to whomsoever God makes application, to and for those and none other Christ made impetration; and for whomsoever Christ impetrated, to those and to all those God makes application. And as touching *faith*, we hold, that as God respecteth faith in application, so Christ respecteth faith in impetration, so as faith is precedent in both: and so God and Christ, had respect unto the same persons, and unto the same qualification of the persons: but that faith is to come between impetration and application, is but an Arminian devise; dividing the confideration and respects of *God* and *Christ*, of the *Father* and

and the *Son*, about one and the same work of Redemption: and so I come to the Confutation.

1 For the absurdnes of this distinctiō of impetration and application; & the Arminian devise, of faith coming between them, as a condition of the latter onely: put case, that a King, having subjects in thraldom and captivity under a forreign King, and to ransom & redeem them, he sends his onely Son, to lay in bondage and captivity for them and in their stead and place; and this the King doth without any condition at all, to be performed by his subjects: If now the forreign King, refuseth to deliver & set free the subjects, unless they will perform some condition first, which he imposeth upon them, and which their own King never required of them in sending his Son, nor did his Son go into captivity for them upon any such condition: is it not absurd to imagine, that the forreign King should require a condition to be performed by the subjects, before he will apply the ransom to them, and set them free? it must needs be absurd, for you must imagine, folly & ignorance in the one King, or fraud

and

and deceit in the other *King*, in that they were not first agreed both on the same terms, before the son was put into captivity. So is the case, if Faith goeth between impetration and application; and if Christ died for men absolutely without the condition of Faith, and yet God will require the condition of Faith, before he will make application & set men free from their sins and condemnation.

I know nothing they have to say, to free themselves of this absurdity but this, that both the Kings, Christ and God, were at the first agreed on the same terms, as thus: they both agreed, that Christ should impetrate and die for all men absolutely, without consideration of any faith in them; but that God should apply Christs death to none but believers, or to such as did first believe: To this I reply, that this occasion is guilty of these absurdities.

1 That the King should put his onely son, to live in thraldom and bondage; and his son should willingly endure all this misery, for millions, even the greater number of his subjects in captivity, whom he *foresaw* and knew well, should not be a rush the better

for

for it, because they would not keep the condition agreed on. Will any wise man, give and pay a certain price certainly, for an uncertain possession, be it of house or land? much less will any pay aforehand, for that land or house, which he foresees he shall never enjoy? yet such a purchaser they make Christ to be by this agreement.

The absurdness also of this may appear by this simile: *Abraham* bought of the *Hittites*, for 400 shekels of silver, a field to bury his wife in; and upon the payment of the mony, the field was delivered to him for a possession, *Gen.*23.16, *&c.* now is it not absurd to imagine, that *Abraham* and the *Hittites*, should both be agreed, that *Abraham* should buy and pay for the field absolutely without any condition, but yet the *Hittites* should require a condition to go between paying and possession, and before *Abraham* should have possession? and without it, no possession? where a condition is required, it always goes before payment; never after, or between payment and possession: so though they in words ascribe *wisdom* to God, saying, that God may according to his infinite

finite wisdom, order Faith to go before or after impetration, yet in this case indeed, they impute absurdness and *folly* to God, in puting the condition of Faith after the price of Christs death. (The case is the same, in buying a thing, as *Abraham* did for himself, or for a mans friend or friends, as Christ did.)

1 They say, Christs *intention* was by his death to *save* all men, even unbelievers in *Acta Synodalia*, pag. 344. now for Christ to agree with God, to put in a condition of *Faith* after impetration, is a contradiction and crossing of his *intension*: for by his death, he intended to save unbelievers, but by agreeing to require Faith of unbelievers, or they to be denied salvation, he (foreseeing they would not and should not believe) *intended* not to have them saved: for he agreed to a condition which barred them from salvation: so much for the absurdity of this agreement.

2 Another absurdity in the distinction is this: It maketh God to be an *unjust Judge*: for Christ by his impetration and dying for the sins of unbelievers, hath born the *punishment* of their

their sins for them in this life; now for God to punish unbelievers for their sins in the next life (as he will *Mark* 16. 16.) is to punish twice over for the same sins, which is an act of injustice in God: now this must be so, if you distinguish of impetration and application in such sort, as they concurr not in the same persons, but are divided, so as impetration belongs unto unbelievers, but application belongs not to them: for if application and justification belongs not to them, then they must suffer punishment for their sins in the next life, and so God shall be unjust: for after he hath punished unbelievers in Christ their *suretie*, he shall punish them again, in their own persons: so you see, impetration and application are not to be distinguished in respect of persons, as if the one belonged to some persons, but not the other, unless you will make God to be an unjust Judge.

3 I shall confute this distinction by a Text of Scripture, understanding it in the Arminian sence: see 2. *Cor.* 5. 15, 19. In *verse* 15. speaking of Christ and his death, in saith, *one died for all*, &c. Here I understand the

word

finite wisdom, order Faith to go before or after impetration, yet in this case indeed, they impute absurdness and *folly* to God, in puting the condition of Faith after the price of Christs death. (The case is the same, in buying a thing, as *Abraham* did for himself, or for a mans friend or friends, as Christ did.)

1 They say, Christs *intention* was by his death to *save* all men, even unbelievers in *Acta Synodalia*, pag. 344. now for Christ to agree with God, to put in a condition of *Faith* after impetration, is a contradiction and crossing of his *intension*: for by his death, he intended to save unbelievers, but by agreeing to require Faith of unbelievers, or they to be denied salvation, he (foreseing they would not and should not believe) *intended* not to have them saved: for he agreed to a condition which barred them from salvation: so much for the absurdity of this agreement.

2 An other absurdity in the distinction is this: It maketh God to be an *unjust Judge*: for Christ by his impetration and dying for the sins of unbelievers, hath born the *punishment* of their

their sins for them in this life; now for God to punish unbelievers for their sins in the next life (as he will *Mark* 16. 16.) is to punish twice over for the same sins, which is an act of injustice in God: now this must be so, if you distinguish of impetration and application in such sort, as they concurr not in the same persons, but are divided, so as impetration belongs unto unbelievers, but application belongs not to them: for if application and justification belongs not to them, then they must suffer punishment for their sins in the next life, and so God shall be unjust: for after he hath punished unbelievers in Christ their *surety*, he shall punish them again, in their own persons: so you see, impetration and application are not to be distinguished in respect of persons, as if the one belonged to some persons, but not the other, unless you will make God to be an unjust Judge.

3 I shall confute this distinction by a Text of Scripture, understanding it in the Arminian sence: see 2. *Cor.* 5. 15, 19. In *verse* 15. speaking of Christ and his death, it saith, *one died for all*, &c. Here I understand the word

word *all*, in the Arminian ſenſe: and then in *verſe* 19. it ſpeaketh again of Chriſt and his death, ſaying, *God was in Chriſt*, (that is, in Chriſt upon the Croſs, when he died for all) *and reconciled the world unto himſelf, not imputing their ſins unto them.* So here you have the impetration of Chriſts death; and the application of it, in reconciliation and not imputation of ſins: now here *application*, is made as large as *impetration*, and to belong unto the ſame perſons, without diſtinction or diviſion: for thoſe [all] which Chriſt died for, were all of them reconciled to God, and juſtified, *their ſins not being imputed unto them*: the ſame *world* which Chriſt died for, *John* 3. 16. the ſame was reconciled and had no ſins imputed to them. So S. *Paul* did not allow of this Arminian diſtinction and diviſion, of impetration and application, in the Arminian ſenſe, ſo as impetration ſhould be underſtood more largely for perſons than application; or as if impetration had been for all men, and application but for ſome men.

4 This diſtinction is guiltie yet of another abſurditie, for it makes the

means

means of *faith*, to be used altogether too late, and so to become an unprofitable and frivolous means: for Arminians make faith to be a means to avoid an evil, after the evil is past. They say, Christ by his *impetration*, suffered the evil of death for unbelievers: now in as much as Christ suffered death, and bore the evil of punishment of unbelievers, for them and in their stead and room, they themselves have suffered death, and bore the evil of punishment in the person of Christ: now after unbelievers have born the evil of punishment, it is too late to use *faith* as a means to obtain *application*, and justification, and a freedom from the evil of punishment: for thus they should use a means to avoid an evil, after the evil is past, and so the means of faith is made unprofitable and frivolous: wherefore should I use any means to avoid imprisonment, when my Suretie hath suffered imprisonment for me? were not means in this case frivolous? If Christ did *impetrate* and die for *Iudas* and in his stead, then *Iudas* hath suffered death by his Suretie Christ; what need then is there of *faith* in *Judas*, as a *means* to obtain

obtain *application* and freedom from death, after he hath suffered death by his Surety? This were if a Judge should hang a man for his offence, and then require him to use means to free himself from death. And so much for confutation of this distinction, of *Imputation* and *Application*.

FINIS.